

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 5 and 11 are amended. No new matter is added.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiner Haugland in the February 22, 2006 telephone interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

During the telephone interview, Examiner Haugland indicated that the proposed ~~interview~~ amendments to the claims to clarify that the buffer unit is configured to separate from the ~~summary~~ continuous paper when the continuous paper is feeding forward would raise new issues.
o.K.
SJT

Although applicants believe that such amendments only amplify issues previously argued, Applicants have filed an RCE to expedite prosecution.

Claims 7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The features recited in claims 7 and 9 are described by the specification as originally filed, for example, at page 14, lines 20-25. Therefore, claims 7 and 9 fully comply with the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 5, 6 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,685,471 to Taubenberger. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 5 recites *inter alia* "a buffer unit provided between the paper-position restricting section and the frictionally transporting section and configured to come into contact with a surface of the continuous paper when the continuous paper is feeding back, and to separate from the surface of the continuous paper when the continuous paper is feeding forward." It is respectfully submitted that Taubenberger also fails to disclose, teach or suggest these features.